

REED SMITH LLP  
A limited liability partnership formed in the State of Delaware

1 Scott D. Baker (SBN 84923)  
Email: sbaker@reedsmith.com  
2 John P. Bovich (SBN 150688)  
Email: jbovich@reedsmith.com  
3 William R. Overend (SBN 180209)  
Email: woverend@reedsmith.com  
4 Jonah D. Mitchell (SBN 203511)  
Email: jtmitchell@reedsmith.com  
5 Luisa M. Bonachea (SBN 267664)  
Email: lbonachea@reedsmith.com  
6 REED SMITH LLP  
101 Second Street, Suite 1800  
7 San Francisco, CA 94105-3659  
Telephone: +1 415 543 8700  
8 Facsimile: +1 415 391 8269

9 Attorneys for Plaintiff  
Calix, Inc.

10 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
11 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
12 SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

13 CALIX NETWORKS, INC., a Delaware  
14 Corporation,

15 Plaintiff,

16 vs.

17 WI-LAN, INC., a Canadian Corporation,

18 Defendant.

Case No. 09-6038 CRB

**STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED]  
ORDER EXTENDING PATENT RULE  
DEADLINES**

**[Civ. L.R. 6-2 & 7-12]**

Pursuant to Civil Local Rules 6-2 and 7-12, Plaintiff Calix, Inc. (“Calix”) and Defendant Wi-Lan, Inc. (“Wi-Lan”), by and through their respective undersigned counsel, hereby stipulate to and request the Court as follows:

1. On October 29, 2010, Wi-LAN and Calix filed a Joint Case Management Statement (Docket No. 78). In the Joint Case Management Statement, the parties agreed to various deadlines, including:

Deadline for parties to comply with Patent L.R.4-2(a) (exchange of Preliminary Claim Construction & Identification of Extrinsic Evidence)	March 21, 2011
Deadline for parties to comply with Patent L.R. 4-3 (file Joint Claim Construction & Prehearing Statement)	May 16, 2011
Deadline for parties to comply with Patent L.R. 4-4 (complete all discovery relating to Claim Construction)	June 15, 2011

2. On November 5, 2010, this Court subsequently held a Case Management Conference and set the claim construction hearing date to August 11, 2011 and tutorial date to August 9, 2011. *See* Minutes dated Nov. 5, 2010 (Docket No. 79).

3. On March 18, 2011, the Parties filed a Stipulation and (Proposed) Order Extending Patent Rule Deadlines (Docket No. 87) extending the time in which to comply with Patent L.R.4-2(a) and Patent L.R.4-3 to April 21, 2011 and June 1, 2011, respectively. The parties had requested that extension based on ongoing settlement discussions. On March 22, 2011, the Court granted the stipulation (Docket No. 88).

4. On April 19, 2011, the Parties filed a second Stipulation and Proposed Order Extending Patent Rule Deadlines (Docket No. 91) extending the time in which to comply with Patent L.R.4-2(a), Patent L.R.4-3, and Patent L.R. 4-4 to May 24, 2011, June 15, 2011, and June 29, 2011, respectively. On April 20, 2011, the Court granted the stipulation (Docket No. 92).

5. The parties have now signed a binding term sheet and are working toward finalizing a definitive settlement agreement. Accordingly, the parties believe that a further continuance of the deadlines set forth herein would facilitate the settlement process and allow the parties additional

time to resolve this matter. Thus, the parties jointly agree and request that the deadlines set forth herein should be continued. Accordingly, the parties hereby stipulate to and propose the following deadlines:

Deadline for parties to comply with Patent L.R.4-2(a) (exchange of Preliminary Claim Construction & Identification of Extrinsic Evidence)	June 15, 2011
Deadline for parties to comply with Patent L.R. 4-3 (file Joint Claim Construction & Prehearing Statement)	June 29, 2011
Deadline for parties to comply with Patent L.R. 4-4 (complete all discovery relating to Claim Construction)	July 6, 2011

6. The continuances requested herein will not affect any other deadlines set by the Court, including the date presently scheduled for the Claim Construction hearing.

7. Pursuant to Civil L.R. 6-2(a)(1)-(3), this stipulated request is accompanied by the Declaration of William R. Overend setting forth (a) the reasons for the requested rescheduling; (b) all previous time modifications in the case; and (c) the effect of the requested rescheduling.

IT IS SO STIPULATED.

Respectfully submitted,

DATED: May 23, 2011.

REED SMITH LLP

By /s/ William R. Overend

William R. Overend  
Attorneys for Plaintiff  
Calix Networks, Inc.

DATED: May 23, 2011.

MCKOOL SMITH, P.C.

By /s/ Michael G. McManus

Michael G. McManus (*pro hac vice*)  
Attorneys for Defendant  
Wi-LAN, Inc.

I hereby attest that I have obtained the concurrence in the filing of this document for any signatures on this document indicated by a “conformed” signature (/s/) and I have on file records to support this concurrence for subsequent production for the Court if so ordered or for inspection upon request.

REED SMITH LLP


William R. Overend  
Attorneys for Plaintiff  
Calix Networks, Inc.

ORDER

PURSUANT TO STIPULATION, IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: May 24, 2011

Honorable Charles R. Breyer  
United States District Court



REED SMITH LLP  
A limited liability partnership formed in the State of Delaware